

October 3, 2001

Sent via e-mail, hand-delivery, and/or U.S. Mail

Mary L. Cottrell, Secretary  
Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy  
One South Station, 2nd Floor  
Boston, MA 02110

Re: Verizon's Alternative Regulation Plan, D.T.E. 01-31

Dear Ms. Cottrell:

Enclosed for filing please find the Attorney General's Fourth Set of Document and Information Requests to Verizon Massachusetts, AG-VZ-4-1 to 4-11, together with a Certificate of Service in the above-referenced proceeding.

Sincerely,

Karlen J. Reed  
Assistant Attorney General  
Utilities Division  
200 Portland Street, 4th Floor  
Boston, MA 02114  
(617) 727-2200

KJR/kr

Enc.

cc: D.T.E. 01-31 Service List (w/enc.)

**THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS  
DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND ENERGY**

---

Investigation by the Department of Telecommunications and Energy on )	)	
its own Motion into the Appropriate Regulatory Plan to succeed Price Cap )	)	
Regulation for Verizon New England, Inc. d/b/a Verizon Massachusetts' )	)	D.T.E. 01-31
intrastate retail telecommunications services in the Commonwealth )	)	
of Massachusetts )	)	

---

**ATTORNEY GENERAL'S  
FOURTH SET OF DOCUMENT AND INFORMATION REQUESTS  
TO VERIZON MASSACHUSETTS**

**INSTRUCTIONS**

1. These Document and Information Requests call for all information, including information contained in documents, which relates to the subject matter of the requests and which is known or available to Verizon New England d/b/a Verizon Massachusetts ("Verizon MA" or "Company") or to any individual or entity sponsoring testimony or retained by the Company to provide information, advice, testimony or other services in connection with this proceeding.
2. Where a Request has a number of separate subdivisions or related parts or portions, a complete response is required to each such subdivision, part, or portion. Any objection to a Request should clearly indicate the subdivision, part, or portion of the Request to which it is directed.
3. If information requested is not available in the exact form requested, provide such information or documents as are available that best respond to the Request.
4. These requests are continuing in nature and require supplemental responses when further or different information with respect to the same is obtained.
5. Each response should be furnished on a separate page headed by the individual Request being answered. Individual responses of more than one page should be stapled or bound and each page consecutively numbered.

6. Each Document and Information Request to "Please provide all documents..." or similar phrases includes a request to "identify" all such documents. "Identify" means to state the nature of the document, the date on which it was prepared, the subject matter and the titles and the names and positions of each person who participated in the preparation of the document, the addressee and the custodian of the documents. To the extent that a document is self-identifying, it need not be separately identified.
7. For each document produced or identified in a response which is computer generated, state separately (a) what types of data, files, or tapes are included in the input and the source thereof, (b) the form of the data which constitutes machine input (e.g., punch cards, tapes), (c) a description of the recordation system employed (including descriptions, flow charts, etc.), and (d) the identity of the person who was in charge of the collection of input materials, the processing of input materials, the data bases utilized, and the programming to obtain the output.
8. If a Document and Information Request can be answered in whole or part by reference to the response to another Request served in this proceeding, it is sufficient to so indicate by specifying the other Request by participant and number, by specifying the parts of the other response which are responsive, and by specifying whether the response to the other Request is a full or partial response to the instant Request. If it constitutes a partial response, the balance of the instant Request must be answered.
9. If the Company cannot answer a Request in full, after exercising due diligence to secure the information necessary to do so, state the answer to the extent possible, state why the Company cannot answer the Request in full, and state what information or knowledge is in the Company's possession concerning the unanswered portions.
10. If, in answering any of these Document and Information requests, you feel that any Request or definition or instruction applicable thereto is ambiguous, set forth the language you feel is ambiguous and the interpretation you are using responding to the Request.
11. If a document requested is no longer in existence, identify the document, and describe in detail the reasons the document is unavailable.
12. Provide copies of all requested documents. A response which does not provide the Attorney General with the responsive documents, and requests the Attorney General to inspect documents at any location is not responsive.

13. If you refuse to respond to any Document and Information Request by reason of a claim of privilege, or for any other reason, state in writing the type of privilege claimed and the facts and circumstances you rely upon to support the claim of privilege or the reason for refusing to respond. With respect to requests for documents to which you refuse to respond, identify each such document.
14. Each request for information includes a request for all documentation which supports the response provided.
15. Provide two copies of each response.
16. Unless the Request specifically provides otherwise, the term "Company" refers to Verizon MA's intrastate operations and includes all witnesses, representatives, employees, and legal counsel.
17. Please furnish each response on a separate sheet of paper, beginning with a restatement of the question.
18. Please provide all responses to requests within 10 calendar days from receipt of request, as per the Hearing Officer's Ground Rules issued May 7, 2001.

**THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS  
DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND ENERGY**

---

Investigation by the Department of Telecommunications and Energy on )  
its own Motion into the Appropriate Regulatory Plan to succeed Price Cap )  
Regulation for Verizon New England, Inc. d/b/a Verizon Massachusetts' ) D.T.E. 01-31  
intrastate retail telecommunications services in the Commonwealth )  
of Massachusetts )  
)

---

**ATTORNEY GENERAL'S  
FOURTH SET OF DOCUMENT AND INFORMATION REQUESTS  
TO VERIZON MASSACHUSETTS**

- AG-VZ-4-1** Please refer to page 11 of Mr. Mudge's rebuttal testimony, wherein he states, "[i]n Charlestown, for example, RCN has entered into an exclusive agreement with the developer of a new condominium complex. In that case, Verizon MA was excluded from serving customers because the carrier and property owner entered into an exclusive agreement to serve customers in the condominium."
- a. In the referenced example, did Verizon MA seek to enter into an interconnection agreement with RCN so as to enable it to serve those customers? If not, why not?
  - b. Since the Charlestown situation is listed as an "example," please provide a list of all other instances in Massachusetts over the past two years in which such "exclusive agreements" between carriers other than Verizon MA and property owners resulted in the inability of Verizon MA to serve those customers, indicating the location of the instance and the CLEC involved.
  - c. In each such instance, indicate whether or not Verizon MA sought to enter into an interconnection agreement with the CLEC in question. If no interconnection agreement was pursued, indicate the reason for the inaction.
- AG-VZ-4-2** Please refer to page 14 of Mr. Mudge's rebuttal testimony, where quotes an AT&T Group Earnings Commentary of July 23, 2001.
- a. Please provide a copy of the document from which this quote came.
  - b. Does Mr. Mudge claim that AT&T contends that "nearly 300,000 lines [have

been] added year to date” *in Massachusetts*? If not, how many AT&T lines does Mr. Mudge believe have been added *in Massachusetts* in the past year?

**AG-VZ-4-3** Please refer to Mr. Mudge’s rebuttal testimony, Attachment 2.

- a. Please provide all details as to how the “original ASR submitted by the carrier was not complete.”
- b. Please identify by name the “Verizon MA representative” and “the carrier” described in Attachment 2 and provide all details of the communication between the Verizon MA representative and the carrier in which the carrier allegedly was advised “that there were incorrect assignments provided on the ASR on April 27th, May 4th and May 7th.” Please also provide the “additional information” that was furnished to Verizon MA by the carrier on May 4th, May 8th and May 9<sup>th</sup>.
- c. Please provide copies of all notes and other documentation in Verizon MA’s possession pertaining to the ETI service that is discussed in Mr. Mudge’s rebuttal testimony, Attachment 2.
- d. Please identify by name the individuals who assisted Mr. Mudge in preparing Attachment 2 and provide copies of all documents upon which Mr. Mudge relied in preparing Attachment 2.
- e. Please indicate whether Verizon MA is in possession of the New Jersey Division of the Ratepayer Advocate’s response to Verizon New Jersey interrogatory VNJ-RPA-90 in New Jersey Board of Public Utilities Docket No. TO01020095, in which the Ratepayer Advocate provided Verizon New Jersey with a copy of ETI’s detailed notes regarding its interactions with AT&T and Verizon relative to the T-1 service at Two Center Plaza.
- f. Please identify by name and provide a copy of all notes taken by “Verizon MA’s local service engineer” pertaining to his site visit to ETI’s premises at Two Center Plaza on May 22, 2001.
- g. Please provide all written guidelines, policies or practices supporting the contention allegedly made by “Verizon MA’s engineer ... that Verizon MA’s regular practice is to provision T1 service via fiber and electronics whenever possible.”
- h. Please provide copies of any and all cost studies, engineering economic

analyses, and underlying data comparing the cost of a fiber optic vs. a copper provisioning arrangement where the customer requirement is for a single T1 line only and where the distance between the customer and the serving wire center is in the range of 500 feet or less.

- i. Please identify by name, title and organizational affiliation within Verizon all individuals with whom Mr. Mudge conferred in preparing Attachment 2. For each such conversation, provide the date at which it occurred, the name(s) of all persons present, and the nature of the subjects discussed. Indicate what steps, if any, Mr. Mudge undertook to verify the accuracy of the information furnished to him.

**AG-VZ-4-4** Please refer to Mr. Mudge's rebuttal testimony, Attachment 1.

- a. Please identify by name, title, and corporate affiliation (department) the individuals who prepared the "Massachusetts Competitive Profile" that was provided as Attachment 1 to Mr. Mudge's rebuttal testimony.
- b. Please state the dates over which this document was prepared, *i.e.*, the start date and the end date for the project.
- c. Please identify by name, title, and corporate affiliation (department) the Verizon MA individuals and outside consultants who have been furnished access to the "Massachusetts Competitive Profile" to date.
- d. Please indicate whether Verizon MA has prepared other "Massachusetts Competitive Profiles" or their equivalent within the past six years. If the answer is anything other than an unqualified negative, please provide the dates on which all such prior or other "Massachusetts Competitive Profile" documents were prepared, the names, times and corporate affiliation (department) of the individual(s) who prepared the documents, the names, titles and corporation affiliation (department) of the individuals who requested that such documents be prepared, and a detailed description of the contents of each such document.

**AG-VZ-4-5** Please provide a copy of the Criterion Economics LLC document referenced on page 13, footnote 19, of William E. Taylor's rebuttal testimony entitled, "An Assessment of the Competitive Local Exchange Carriers Five Years After the Passage of the Telecommunications Act."

**AG-VZ-4-6** Please refer to page 13 of William E. Taylor's rebuttal testimony. Please provide the number of access lines (business and residential separately) served by AOL Time

Warner, McLeod USA, Allegiance Telecom and XO Communications *in Massachusetts*. If available, please also indicate the manner in which these access lines are provided (resale, UNE/UNE-P, or facilities-based).

- AG-VZ-4-7** Please provide a copy of the document entitled “CLEC Shopping Days?” which is quoted on page 18, footnote 37, of William E. Taylor’s rebuttal testimony.
- AG-VZ-4-8** Please refer to the direct testimony of William E. Taylor, page 4, line 12, where he states: “...entry into Massachusetts’ retail telecommunications markets is comparatively easy,” and to page 16, footnote 27, of the rebuttal testimony of Dr. Taylor. Is it Dr. Taylor’s contention that the investment of \$55-billion in infrastructure by CLECs is indicative of “easy” entry into retail telecommunications markets?
- AG-VZ-4-9** Please refer to the rebuttal testimony of William E. Taylor, page 21, lines 6-7, wherein Dr. Taylor states “assuming that revenue on each Verizon MA line is 30 percent less and that revenue on each CLEC line is 30 percent more than the average revenue of all lines ... .”
- a. Has the witness performed or caused to be performed an analysis as to the actual current relationship between the percentage difference in revenue for Verizon MA lines as compared to the average revenue of all lines? If so, please identify the actual calculation and provide the supporting study.
  - b. Has the witness performed or caused to be performed an analysis as to the actual current relationship between the percentage difference in revenue for Massachusetts CLEC lines as compared to the average revenue of all lines? If so, please identify the actual calculation and provide the supporting study.
- AG-VZ-4-10** Please refer to the rebuttal testimony of William E. Taylor, page 21, lines 16-19, wherein Dr. Taylor states that he relies upon assumptions that “resold to UNE/UNE-P lines lost are in a 60/40 relationship and that the cost of a UNE/UNE-P is 80 percent below Verizon MA’s retail price ... .”
- a. Has the witness performed or caused to be performed an analysis as to the actual current relationship between the number of lines lost to CLECs via resale versus the number of lines lost to CLECs via UNE/UNE-P? If so, please identify the relationship and provide the supporting study.
  - b. Has the witness performed or caused to be performed an analysis as to the actual current relationship between Verizon MA’s retail price and the cost of a UNE/UNE-P, as referenced in the testimony? If so, please identify the



relationship and provide the supporting study. If no such study has been conducted, please identify the specific wholesale and retail rate elements upon which the quoted statement is based. If no such study has been conducted, please identify the specific wholesale and retail rate elements that Dr. Taylor envisions would be included in such an analysis that would permit an analyst to calculate the actual current percentage of the retail price that the UNE/UNE-P costs represent (i.e., the 80% figure assumed in Dr. Taylor's testimony).

**AG-VZ-4-11**

Please refer to Verizon's response in AG-VZ-1-8(a) and AG-VZ-2-2(e).

- a. Please give the edition number, page number, and paragraph reference in the CLEC 2001 Study for each RCN reference described in Verizon MA's response to AG-VZ-1-8(a). Please note that this is our second request for this information.
- b. Please provide copies of the pages referenced above.

**THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS  
DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND ENERGY**

---

Investigation by the Department of Telecommunications and Energy on )		
its own Motion into the Appropriate Regulatory Plan to succeed Price Cap )		
Regulation for Verizon New England, Inc. d/b/a Verizon Massachusetts' )		D.T.E. 01-31
intrastate retail telecommunications services in the Commonwealth )		
of Massachusetts )		

---

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document upon each person designated on the official service list compiled by the Secretary in this proceeding by either hand delivery, mail, and/or e-mail.

Dated at Boston this 3rd day of October 2001.

---

Karlen J. Reed  
Assistant Attorney General  
Utilities Division  
200 Portland Street, 4th Floor  
Boston, MA 02114  
(617) 727-2200